UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,798	07/08/2005	Michael R Song	1041-0001WOUS	4211

49698   7590   05/28/2008
MICHAUD-DUFFY GROUP LLP
306 INDUSTRIAL PARK ROAD
SUITE 206
MIDDLETOWN, CT 06457

EXAMINER
LIANG, VEI CHUNG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2169	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/541,798	SONG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	VEI-CHUNG LIANG	2169	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 February 2008*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.
7)☒ Claim(s) *3* is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Action is responsive to the communication filed on February 13, 2008. In responding to Applicants' Amendments made to the claims, the Examiner has created this Office Action for Final Rejection (hereinafter referred as "the Action") as shown next. Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 have been amended. Claims 17 - 22 have been added. Claims 1 - 22 are pending.

2.   Please note the Action is drafted in response to the Amendments and written in different style with additional description due to change of Examiner for examining this application.

3.   Applicants argument filed on February 13, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Please see Examiner's response in "**Response to Arguments**", following the Action shown next. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-22 are pending, of which **Claims 1, 16, and 22** are in independent form.

Claim Objections

4.   Claim 17 recites the limitation of "wherein said clustering of KID within said

standardized scheme is adapted to particular needs..." is indirect, suggest optionally,

and passive which renders any recitation claimed after not be given patentable weight.

Appropriate correction is required. The claim language "adapted to particular needs"

that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not

limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim

limitation. See MPEP 2106 II.C. and MPEP 2111.04.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6.   Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply

with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one

skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had

possession of the claimed invention.

As per Claim 18, claim 18 recited "wherein said rules for allocating KID include:

maintaining a minimum number of electronic storage location by eliminating software

application default storage locations; implementing a minimum number of total

electronic and physical storage locations; using said priority based scheme of said

plurality of logical partitions to dictate an appropriate storage level for KID that could be

placed in more than one level and subset within said levels; using a general subset for

segregating KID that properly references more than one of subset of said logical

partitions; naming all KID so as to include at least a date and content information in a

title thereof;...maximizing exposure to guides, maps and labels itemizing contents of

said logical partitions to highlight pathways for locating KID; ... consistently labeling

UKIDS levels and subsets to reflect contents of said logical partitions; establishing

guidelines for duration of KID storage in physical UKIDS storage means" which was not

described in the originally filed disclosure.

7.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

     As per Claim 3, Claim 3 recites the limitation ""said activities and organizations

subset" in Lines 1 - 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the

claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10.   Claims 1 – 17, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu U.S 20030065663 A1 (hereinafter referred as Chu) in view of Kemp U.S 20040024775 A1 (hereinafter referred as Kemp).

As per Claim 1, Chu teaches "a system for storing knowledge, information and data, comprising a plurality of sources of KID, a plurality of receivers of KID from said plurality of sources" as indicating, to submit requests to the knowledge repositories 34 and 36, the end user 32 invokes a client system 38. Within the client system 38, a client application 40 receives information from the end user 32 sufficient to formulate a request for the knowledge repositories (See Chu Page 1 Paragraph 0016). The examiner is reading knowledge repositories as a plurality of sources of knowledge information data.

Furthermore Chu discloses, "a universal knowledge, information and data store UKIDS) and an interface coupling said receivers and said UKIDS, said interface providing a plurality of partitions for segregating and storing said KID in a priority-based and standardized scheme within said UKIDS" by stating, the knowledge repository interface system 30 provides an end user 32 with a powerful and user-friendly interface to remotely access knowledge repositories 34 and 36. An end user 32, such as a human operator or computer application, may need to execute or review results from sophisticated models contained in the knowledge repositories 34 and 36 (See Chu Page 1 Paragraph 0016).

Chu teaches "and wherein said standardized scheme includes a clustering of KID

to promote transferability between said receivers, extensibility across data store

platforms and scalability in understanding of said KID by each of said receivers" remote

web server is capable of returning a list in an XML format of all decision tree models

that are contained in the remote knowledge repositories (Chu, paragraph 0038).

Chu teaches "Said interface further providing rules and tools for configuring said

UKIDS and for storing and accessing KID included therein" as a knowledge repository

sever system may contain both similar and different APIs from other knowledge

repository server systems. For example, all knowledge repository server systems may

contain general API that retrieves all models contained in their own knowledge

repositories. Knowledge repository server systems may also contain different APIs in

order to provide information specific to their respective knowledge repositories.

Knowledge repository server system contain APIs specific to how decision tree model

are structured (Chu, paragraph 0022).

Chu teaches "wherein said rules define methods for allocating KID within one of

said plurality of logical partitions, for purging KID from said UKIDS, and for efficiently

sharing and distributing KID between said receivers" as the requester module

determining the nature and details of the request and determining which knowledge

repositories concern the request (Chu, paragraph 0018).

Chu does not explicitly teach "a first level of said logical partitions segregates KID

storage into personal and professional levels, wherein a plurality of second personal

levels under said first personal level segregates KID storage into teams of people

subset, an activities and organization subset and an organization and administration subset and wherein a plurality of second professional levels under said first professional level segregates KID storage into a clients subset, an output subset, a teams subset and an administration subset".

On the other hand, Kemp disclose such limitation as by indicating In some embodiments of the invention it is advantageous to break down information within a given field into a number of analytical topics, such as those listed herein as examples within the legal field, and to classify information within those topics as belonging to one or more types, where those types are the same or substantially the same or similar across all or most of the topics. For example, in a system for providing legal information using the topic list set out above, the types or classes "administrative action," "current rulemaking," "news," "recent cases," and "legislative alert" have been found to be widely applicable. In some embodiments the use of such widely applicable types or classes can assist the processing and accessing of information. Information can also be broken down according to, and assigned identifiers as belonging to, one or more layers of subtopics, such topic "property" and subtopics "real estate," "ownership," and "deed of trust." Designation of topics, subtopics, and types or classes may be according to an index tree or other scheme provided, or agreed to, by provider 101(See Kemp Page 5 Paragraph 0042).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Chu's teaching of a plurality of sources of KID that was segregated KID into personal and professional levels of logical partitions disclosed

by Kemp. Doing so would provide a means for effectively accessing and storing KID on

different levels/subset.

The combination of Chu and Kemp teaches "wherein said priority based scheme

reflects personal and professional core values of a free enterprise economic systems"

as scheme is provided to break down information such as administrative action, news,

real estate, ownership (Kemp, paragraph 0042).

The combination of Chu and Kemp teaches "wherein said tools include features

and functions for presenting news and advertising of interest to said receivers" as

scheme is provided to break down information such as administrative action, news, real

estate, ownership (Kemp, paragraph 0042).

The combination of Chu and Kemp teaches "for identifying targeted storage

locations within specific ones of said plurality of logical partitions, for backup and

archiving KID and for securing KID in said UKIDS" as the requester module determining

the nature and details of the request and determining which knowledge repositories

concern the request (Chu, paragraph 0018).

As per claim 2, and also applied to claim 1, the combination of Chu and Kemp

teaches "a storage system wherein said teams of people subset includes KID pertaining

to family, friends, and other groups of person interest to said receivers." as, for example,

in a system for providing legal information using the topic list set out above, the types or

classes "administrative action," "current rulemaking," "news," "recent cases," and

"legislative alert" have been found to be widely applicable. In some embodiments the

use of such widely applicable types or classes can assist the processing and accessing

of information. Information can also be broken down according to, and assigned

identifiers as belonging to, one or more layers of subtopics, such topic "property" and

subtopics "real estate," "ownership," and "deed of trust." Designation of topics,

subtopics, and types or classes may be according to an index tree or other scheme

provided, or agreed to, by provider 101 (See Kemp Page 5 Paragraph 0042).

Furthermore Kemp discloses, in systems according to the invention adapted for the

provision of legal information, classifications of information relating to individual topics

can by made, for example, by sorting information into classes or types such as

administrative action, legislative action, rulemaking, reported judicial decisions, and

news. In preferred embodiments at least two of these types or classes of information

are provided for legal topics. Topics for legal embodiments of such systems can include,

for example, at least one and preferably more of such topics as: admiralty and maritime;

alternative dispute resolution; antitrust; trade regulation; banking; finance; bankruptcy;

business; commercial; consumer rights; corporate; business organizations; civil rights;

collectibles and personal property; communications; media; constitutional; Construction;

contracts; criminal; education; employment; labor; entertainment; gaming; sports;

environmental; estates, trusts, and wills; family; government; elections and politics;

government benefits; government contracts; government administration; state

government; local government; health; human rights; immigration; insurance; intellectual

property; copyrights; patents; trademarks; trade secrets; international; international

trade; internet; litigation; litigation administration; appellate procedure; civil procedure;

damages and remedies; evidence; mergers and acquisitions; military; natural resources;

energy; native populations; professions and occupations; professional licensing;

professional responsibility; products liability; real property; science and technology;

securities; US federal taxation; state taxation; international taxation; torts; transportation;

and workers' rights (See Kemp Page 3 Paragraph 0021) The examiner is reading this

as a storage system that includes a subset containing the listed information stated

above.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to include Chu's teaching of a plurality of sources of KID that

was segregated KID into personal and professional levels of logical partitions disclosed

by Kemp. Doing so would provide a means for effectively accessing and storing KID on

different subsets that included KID that pertained to family, friends and other groups of

person interest to a user.

As per Claim 3, and also applied to Claim 1, the combination of Chu and

Kemp teaches "a storage system wherein said organizations subset includes KID

pertaining to vacations, sports, entertainment, spirituality, hobbies, and other activities"

as disclosing for example, in a system for providing legal information using the topic list

set out above, the types or classes "administrative action," "current rulemaking," "news,"

"recent cases," and "legislative alert" have been found to be widely applicable. In some

embodiments the use of such widely applicable types or classes can assist the

processing and accessing of information. Information can also be broken down

according to, and assigned identifiers as belonging to, one or more layers of subtopics,

such topic "property" and subtopics "real estate," "ownership," and "deed of trust."

Designation of topics, subtopics, and types or classesmay be according to an index tree

or other scheme provided, or agreed to, by provider 101(See Kemp Page 5 Paragraph

0042).

Furthermore Kemp discloses, in systems according to the invention adapted for

the provision of legal information, classifications of information relating to individual

topics can by made, for example, by sorting information into classes or types such as

administrative action, legislative action, rulemaking, reported judicial decisions, and

news. In preferred embodiments at least two of these types or classes of information

are provided for legal topics. Topics for legal embodiments of such systems can include,

for example, at least one and preferably more of such topics as: admiralty and maritime;

alternative dispute resolution; antitrust; trade regulation; banking; finance; bankruptcy;

business; commercial; consumer rights; corporate; business organizations; civil rights;

collectibles and personal property; communications; media; constitutional; construction;

contracts; criminal; education; employment; labor; entertainment; gaming; sports;

environmental; estates, trusts, and wills; family; government; elections and politics;

government benefits; government contracts; government administration; state

government; local government; health; human rights; immigration; insurance; intellectual

property; copyrights; patents; trademarks; trade secrets; international; international

trade; internet; litigation; litigation administration; appellate procedure; civil procedure;

damages and remedies; evidence; mergers and acquisitions; military; natural resources;

energy; native populations; professions and occupations; professional licensing;

professional responsibility; products liability; real property; science and technology;

securities; US federal taxation; state taxation; international taxation; torts;

transportation; and workers' rights (See Kemp Page 3 Paragraph 0021) The examiner is

reading this as a storage system that includes a subset containing the listed information

stated above.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to include Chu's teaching of a plurality of sources of

KID that was segregated KID into personal and professional levels of logical partitions

disclosed by Kemp. Doing so would provide a means for effectively accessing and

storing KID on different subsets that included KID that includes KID pertaining to

vacations, sports, entertainment, spirituality, hobbies, and other activities.

As per claim 4, and also applied to claim 1, the combination of Chu and Kemp

teaches "a storage system wherein said organization and administration subset includes

KID pertaining to home, upkeep, bills and other financial concerns" as indicating in a

system for providing legal information using the topic list set out above, the types or

classes "administrative action," "current rulemaking," "news," "recent cases," and

"legislative alert" have been found to be widely applicable. In some embodiments the

use of such widely applicable types or classes can assist the processing and accessing

of information. Information can also be broken down according to, and assigned

identifiers as belonging to, one or more layers of subtopics, such topic "property" and

subtopics "real estate," "ownership," and "deed of trust." Designation of topics,

subtopics, and types or classes may be according to an index tree or other scheme

provided, or agreed to, by provider 101 (See Kemp Page 5 Paragraph 0042).

Furthermore Kemp discloses, in systems according to the invention adapted for

the provision of legal information, classifications of information relating to individual

topics can by made, for example, by sorting information into classes or types such as

administrative action, legislative action, rulemaking, reported judicial decisions, and

news. In preferred embodiments at least two of these types or classes of information are

provided for legal topics. Topics for legal embodiments of such systems Can include, for

example, at least one and preferably more of such topics as: admiralty and maritime;

alternative dispute resolution; antitrust; trade regulation; banking; finance; bankruptcy;

business; commercial; consumer rights; corporate; business organizations; civil rights;

collectibles and personal property; communications; media; constitutional; construction;

contracts; criminal; education; employment; labor; entertainment; gaming; sports;

environmental; estates, trusts, and wills; family; government; elections and politics;

government benefits; government contracts; government administration; state

government; local government; health; human rights; immigration; insurance; intellectual

property; copyrights; patents; trademarks; trade secrets; international; international

trade; internet; litigation; litigation administration; appellate procedure; civil procedure;

damages and remedies; evidence; mergers and acquisitions; military; natural resources;

energy; native populations; professions and occupations; professional licensing;

professional responsibility; products liability; real property; science and technology;

securities; US federal taxation; state taxation; international taxation; torts;

transportation; and workers' rights (See Kemp Page 3 Paragraph 0021) The examiner is

reading this as a storage system that includes a subset containing the listed information

stated above.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to include Chu's teaching of a plurality of sources of KID that

was segregated KID into personal and professional levels of logical partitions disclosed

by Kemp. Doing so would provide a means for effectively accessing and storing KID on

different subsets that included KID that pertained to home, upkeep, bills and other

financial concerns.

As per Claim 5, and also applied to Claim 1, the combination of Chu and

Kemp teaches "a storage system wherein said clients subset includes KID pertaining to

philosophical groups of internal and external clients, customers, patrons, client projects,

markets, key vendors, and sales territories" as indicating in a system for providing legal

information using the topic list set out above, the types or classes "administrative

action," "current rulemaking," "news," "recent cases," and "legislative alert" have been

found to be widely applicable. In some embodiments the use of such widely applicable

types or classes can assist the processing and accessing of information. Information

can also be broken down according to, and assigned identifiers as belonging to, one or

more layers of subtopics, such topic "property" and subtopics "real estate," "ownership,"

and "deed of trust." Designation of topics, subtopics, and types or classes may be

according to an index tree or other scheme provided, or agreed to, by provider 101(See

Kemp Page 5 Paragraph 0042).

Furthermore Kemp discloses, in systems according to the invention adapted for

the provision of legal information, classifications of information relating to individual

topics can by made, for example, by sorting information into classes or types such as

administrative action, legislative action, rulemaking, reported judicial decisions, and

news. In preferred embodiments at least two of these types or classes of information

are provided for legal topics. Topics for legal embodiments of such systems can include,

for example, at least one and preferably more of such topics as: admiralty and maritime;

alternative dispute resolution; antitrust; trade regulation; banking; finance; bankruptcy;

business; commercial; consumer rights; Corporate; business organizations; civil rights;

collectibles and personal property; communications; media; constitutional; construction;

contracts; criminal; education; employment; labor; entertainment; gaming; sports;

environmental; estates, trusts, and wills; family; government; elections and politics;

government benefits; government contracts; government administration; state

government; local government; health; human rights; immigration; insurance; intellectual

property; Copyrights; patents; trademarks; trade secrets; international; international

trade; internet; litigation; litigation administration; appellate procedure; civil procedure;

damages and remedies; evidence; mergers and acquisitions; military; natural resources;

energy; native populations; professions and occupations; professional licensing;

professional responsibility; products liability; real property; science and technology;

securities; US federal taxation; state taxation; international taxation; torts;

transportation; and workers' rights (See Kemp Page 3 Paragraph 0021) The examiner is reading this as a storage system that includes a subset containing the listed information stated above.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Chu's teaching of a plurality of sources of KID that was segregated KID into personal and professional levels of logical partitions disclosed by Kemp. Doing so would provide a means for effectively accessing and storing KID on different subsets that included KID that pertained to philosophical groups of internal and external clients, customers, patrons, client projects, markets, key vendors, and sales territories.

As per Claim 6, and also applied to Claim 1, the combination of Chu and Kemp teaches "a storage system wherein said output subset includes KID pertaining to products, services, value added products and services, and any of the aforementioned offered to clients by indicating in a system for providing legal information using the topic list set out above, the types or classes" as indicating in a system for providing legal information using the topic list set out above, the types or classes "administrative action," "current rulemaking," "news," "recent cases," and "legislative alert" have been found to be widely applicable. In some embodiments the use of such widely applicable types or classes can assist the processing and accessing of information. Information can also be broken down according to, and assigned identifiers as belonging to, one or more layers of subtopics, such topic "property" and subtopics "real estate," "ownership,"

and "deed of trust." Designation of topics, subtopics, and types or classes may be according to an index tree or other scheme provided, or agreed to, by provider 101(See Kemp Page 5 Paragraph 0042).

Furthermore Kemp discloses, in systems according to the invention adapted for the provision of legal information, classifications of information relating to individual topics can by made, for example, by sorting information into classes or types such as administrative action, legislative action, rulemaking, reported judicial decisions, and news. In preferred embodiments at least two of these types or classes of information are provided for legal topics. Topics for legal embodiments of such systems can include, for example, at least one and preferably more of such topics as: admiralty and maritime; alternative dispute resolution; antitrust; trade regulation; banking; finance; bankruptcy; business; commercial; consumer rights; corporate; business organizations; civil rights; collectibles and personal property; communications; media; constitutional; construction; contracts; criminal; education; employment; labor; entertainment; gaming; sports; environmental; estates, trusts, and wills; family; government; elections and politics; government benefits; government contracts; government administration; state government; local government; health; human rights; immigration; insurance; intellectual property; copyrights; patents; trademarks; trade secrets; international; international trade; internet; litigation; litigation administration; appellate procedure; civil procedure; damages and remedies; evidence; mergers and acquisitions; military; natural resources; energy; native populations; professions and occupations; professional licensing; professional responsibility; products liability; real property; science and technology;

securities; US federal taxation; state taxation; international taxation; torts;

transportation; and workers' rights (See Kemp Page 3 Paragraph 0021) The examiner is

reading this as a storage system that includes a subset containing the listed information

stated above.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to include Chu's teaching of a plurality of sources of KID that

was segregated KID into personal and professional levels of logical partitions

disclosed by Kemp. Doing so would provide a means for effectively accessing and

storing KID on different subsets that included KID that pertained to products, services,

value added products and services, and any of the aforementioned offered to clients.

As per Claim 7, and also applied to Claim 1, the combination of Chu and

Kemp teaches "a storage system wherein said teams subset includes KID pertaining to

partnerships, collaborations, and any grouping of individuals that provide output to

clients" as indicating in systems according to the invention adapted for the provision of

legal information, classifications of information relating to individual topics can by made,

for example, by sorting information into classes or types such as administrative action,

legislative action, rulemaking, reported judicial decisions, and news. In preferred

embodiments at least two of these types or classes of information are provided for legal

topics. Topics for legal embodiments of such systems can include, for example, at least

one and preferably more of such topics as: admiralty and maritime; alternative dispute

resolution; antitrust; trade regulation; banking; finance; bankruptcy; business;

commercial; consumer rights; corporate; business organizations; civil rights; collectibles

and personal property; communications; media; constitutional; construction; contracts;

criminal; education; employment; labor; entertainment; gaming; sports; environmental;

estates, trusts, and wills; family; government; elections and politics; government

benefits; government contracts; government administration; state government; local

government; health; human rights; immigration; insurance; intellectual property;

copyrights; patents; trademarks; trade secrets; international; international trade;

internet; litigation; litigation administration; appellate procedure; civil procedure;

damages and remedies; evidence; mergers and acquisitions; military; natural resources;

energy; native populations; professions and occupations; professional licensing;

professional responsibility; products liability; real property; science and technology;

securities; US federal taxation; state taxation; international taxation; torts;

transportation; and workers' rights (See Kemp Page 3 Paragraph 0021) The examiner is

reading this as a storage system that includes a subset containing the listed information

stated above.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to include Chu's teaching of a plurality of sources of

KID that was segregated KID into personal and professional levels of logical partitions

disclosed by Kemp. Doing so would provide a means for effectively accessing and

storing KID on different subsets that included KID that pertained to partnerships,

collaborations, and any grouping of individuals that provide output to clients.

As per Claim 8, and also applied to Claim 1, the combination of Chu and

Kemp teaches "a storage system wherein said administration subset includes KID

pertaining to an operation and coordination of a business, business services, work flow

and personnel, <u>and non-core job responsibility</u>" as disclosing in systems according to

the invention adapted for the provision of legal information, classifications of information

relating to individual topics can by made, for example, by sorting information into

classes or types such as administrative action, legislative action, rulemaking, reported

judicial decisions, and news. In preferred embodiments at least two of these types or

classes of information are provided for legal topics. Topics for legal embodiments of

such systems can include, for example, at least one and preferably more of such topics

as: admiralty and maritime; alternative dispute resolution; antitrust; trade regulation;

banking; finance; bankruptcy; business; commercial; consumer rights; corporate;

business organizations; civil rights; collectibles and personal property; communications;

media; constitutional; construction; contracts; criminal; education; employment; labor;

entertainment; gaming; sports; environmental; estates, trusts, and wills; family;

government; elections and politics; government benefits; government contracts;

government administration; state government; local government; health; human rights;

immigration; insurance; intellectual property; copyrights; patents; trademarks; trade

secrets; international; international trade; internet; litigation; litigation administration;

appellate procedure; civil procedure; damages and remedies; evidence; mergers and

acquisitions; military; natural resources; energy; native populations; professions and

occupations; professional licensing; professional responsibility; products liability; real

property; science and technology; securities; US federal taxation; state taxation; international taxation; torts; transportation; and workers' rights (See Kemp Page 3 Paragraph 0021) The examiner is reading this as a storage system that includes a subset containing the listed information stated above.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Chu's teaching of a plurality of sources of KID that was segregated KID into personal and professional levels of logical partitions disclosed by Kemp. Doing so would provide a means for effectively accessing and storing KID on different subsets that included KID that pertained to an operation and coordination of a business, business services, work flow and personnel.

As per Claim 9, and also applied to Claim 1, the combination of Chu and Kemp teaches "a storage system wherein said UKIDS spans a plurality of data storage platforms including electronic and hard copy storage means" as a document, in this sense, includes any information relating to topics of interest to requesting users 150, whether in the form of a paper document of one or more pages; one or more electronic data files; or any other form suitable for implementation of the invention. Documents may be gathered or received, in physical, electronic, or any other form, by sources 170 by delivery from outside parties, such as news reporting agencies, court clerks or reporters, authors, etc.; or they may be created by source (See Kemp Page 4 Paragraph 0040).

Furthermore Kemp discloses, the identification process can be manual or automatic, as for example by application of artificial intelligence or other computer processes, or by a blend thereof or any other means suitable for accomplishing the purposes herein. As an example, a paper document received from a court may be read by a lawyer, paralegal, or other trained person, and associated with one or more topics, such as "securities law," "contracts law," etc., and a suitable identification code, label, or tag assigned. Similarly, the same or another person, or an automated process, can classify the document according to type or class within its topic, as for example through the user of artificial intelligence devices. For example, a paper document received from a court clerk's office can be classed as a newly issued judicial opinion, and assigned a suitable tag or label. Documents may be identified as belonging to one or several topics, and classified as belonging to one or several types, as appropriate (See Kemp Page 5 Paragraph 0041).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Chu's teaching of a plurality of sources of KID that was segregated KID into personal and Professional levels of logical partitions disclosed by Kemp. Doing so would provide a means for effectively accessing and storing KID on different subsets that included UKID that spanned a plurality of data storage platforms that included electronic and hard copy storage means.

As per claim 10, and also applied to Claim 9, the combination of Chu and Kemp teaches "a storage system wherein said electronic storage means includes

computer hard drives, backup and recovery media and off-line storage media" as

indicating at 202 source 170(which may include an affiliate of provider 101, as well as

any third parties) takes in a new document. A document in this sense includes any

information relating to topics of interest to requesting users 150, whether in the form of a

paper document of one or more pages; one or more electronic data files; or any other

form suitable for implementation of the invention. Documents may be gathered or

received, in physical, electronic, or any other form, by sources 170 by delivery from

outside parties, such as news reporting agencies, court clerks or reporters, authors etc.;

or they may be created by source 170 (See Kemp Page 4 Paragraph 0040).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to include Chu's teaching of a plurality of sources of KID that

was segregated KID into personal and professional levels of logical partitions disclosed

by Kemp. Doing so would provide a means for effectively accessing and storing KID on

different subsets that included electronic storage means that consisted of computer

hard drives, backup and recovery media and off-line storage media.

As per Claim 11, and also applied to claim 10, the combination of Chu and

Kemp teaches "a storage system wherein said hard copy storage means includes

bookcases, filing cabinets and desk tops" as disclosing at 202 source 170(which may

include an affiliate of provider 101, as well as any third parties) takes in a new

document. A document in this sense includes any information relating to topics of

interest to requesting users 150, whether in the form of a paper document of one or

more pages; one or more electronic data files; or any other form suitable for

implementation of the invention. Documents may be gathered or received, in physical,

electronic, or any other form, by sources 170 by delivery from outside parties, such as

news reporting agencies, court clerks or reporters, authors etc.; or they may be created

by source 170 (See Kemp Page 4 Paragraph 0040).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to include Chu's teaching of a plurality of sources of KiD that

was segregated KID into personal and professional levels of logical partitions disclosed

by Kemp. Doing so would provide a means for effectively accessing and storing KID on

different subsets that included a hard copy storage means that included bookcases,

filing cabinets and desk tops.

As per Claim 12, and also applied to Claim 1, the combination of Chu and

Kemp teaches "the storage system of claim 1 wherein said interface includes a

graphical user interface that allows <u>each of said receivers </u>direct access to electronic

stored KID within said logical partitions of said UKIDS <u>and to launch one or more of said</u>

<u>tools</u>" as disclosing The screen of FIG. 9 further comprises search portion 901, which

comprises citation data input field 902. A requesting user may enter a search for items

related to specific legal cases by entering a suitable case citation in field 902. By entry a

citation and selection of "GO" icon 903, a requesting user causes user system 150, by

means of a user-accessible terminal 106 to forward to provider 101 a request for

information, the request comprising identifiers corresponding to the citation, and

provider 101 searches general-access databases 121 and optionally any private

databases 121,151 (and third party databases not shown) for which the requesting user

has authorizations for cases and other information items associated with the entered

citation, and provides information responsive to the request to one or more of windows

401-406 (See Kemp Page 9 Paragraph 0090).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to include Chu's teaching of a plurality of sources of KID that

was segregated KID into personal and professional levels of logical partitions disclosed

by Kemp. Doing so would provide a means for effectively accessing and storing KID on

different subsets that included an interface and a graphical user interface that allows a

user direct access to electronic stored KID within said logical partitions of said UKIDS.

As per Claim 13, and also applied to Claim 1, the combination of Chu and

Kemp discloses, "the storage system of claim 1 wherein said interface allows <u>each of</u>

<u>said receivers to distribute KID to other of said receiver and to identify </u>a targeted

<u>location for storing said </u>KID <u>within </u>one of said plurality of logical partitions" as indicating

in addition to fields and items previously described, the screen of FIG10 comprises field

1001 for displaying a list of selected sources 170, and icon "CREATE GROUP" 1004 for

the creation and saving of groups of sources, for use by a requesting user 150

modifying existing search request and in formulating future search request. Also

provided are groups of links to list of sources grouped together by types and/or topics,

as indicated. Selection of one or more sources, or groups of sources, by selection of

corresponding icons, results in designation of suitable identifiers for inclusion in a

request to be made to provider 101, and display of the same or corresponding

identifiers associated with the selected sources in the field 101 (See Kemp Page 10

Paragraph 0096) The examiner is reading the CREATE GROUP icon for the creation

and saving of groups of sources as a targeted delivery of KID (See Kemp Page 10

Paragraph 0096).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to include Chu's teaching of a plurality of sources of KID that

was segregated KID into personal and professional levels of logical partitions disclosed

by Kemp. Doing so would provide a means for effectively accessing and storing KID on

different subsets that included an interface that allows a targeted location from one of

said plurality of logical partitions.

As per Claim 14, and also applied to Claim 13, the combination of Chu and

Kemp teaches "the storage system of claim 13 wherein said targeted storage location is

comprised of a path for manual storage of said distributed KID within said logical

partitions" as indicating at 204 source 170 assigns to and associates with one or more

document identifiers to each of the received documents. Identifiers can include, for

example, serial numbers, topic label character strings or tags, and type or class labels

or tags. The identification process can be manual or automatic, as for example by

application of artificial intelligence or other computer processes, or by a blend thereof or

any other means suitable for accomplishing the purposes herein. As an example, a

paper document received from a court may be read by a lawyer, paralegal, or other

trained person, and associated with one or more topics, such as "securities law,"

"contracts law," etc., and a suitable identification code, label, or tag assigned. Similarly,

the same or another person, or an automated process, can classify the document

according to type or class within its topic, as for example through the user of artificial

intelligence devices. For example, a paper document received from a court clerk's office

can be classed as a newly issued judicial opinion, and assigned a suitable tag or label.

Documents may be identified as belonging to one or several topics, and classified as

belonging to one or several types, as appropriate (See Kemp Page 5 Paragraph 0041)

The examiner is reading the identification process being manual and associated with

one or more topics by a lawyer, paralegal or other trained persons as the targeted

delivery and or manual process as being stored within one logical partition.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to include Chu's teaching of a plurality of sources of KID that

was segregated KID into personal and professional levels of logical partitions disclosed

by Kemp. Doing so would provide a means for effectively accessing and storing KID on

different subsets where targeted delivery is a manual process and the source of KID

specifies a path for manual storage of said target KID within said one logical partition.

As per Claim 15, and also applied to Claim 13, the combination of Chu and

Kemp discloses "the storage system of claim 13 wherein said targeted <u>storage location</u>

<u>is comprised of </u>at least <u>a </u>partially automated <u>one of said tools </u>such that, upon request,

said <u>distributed</u> KID is <u>automatically</u> stored in <u>a specified one of</u> said logical <u>partitions</u>"

as disclosing at 204 source 170 assigns to and associates with one or more document

identifiers to each of the received documents. Identifiers can include, for example, serial

numbers, topic label character strings or tags, and type or class labels or tags. The

identification process can be manual or automatic, as for example by application of

artificial intelligence or other computer processes, or by a blend thereof or any other

means suitable for accomplishing the purposes herein. As an example, a paper

document received from a court may be read by a lawyer, paralegal, or other trained

person, and associated with one or more topics, such as "securities law," "contracts

law," etc., and a suitable identification code, label, or tag assigned. Similarly, the same

or another person, or an automated process, can classify the document according to

type or class within its topic, as for example through the user of artificial intelligence

devices. For example, a paper document received from a court clerk's office can be

classed as a newly issued judicial opinion, and assigned a suitable tag or label.

Documents may be identified as belonging to one or several topics, and classified as

belonging to one or several types, as appropriate (See Kemp Page 5 Paragraph 0041)

The examiner is reading the identification process being manual and associated with

one or more topics by a lawyer, paralegal or other trained persons as the targeted

delivery and or manual process as ,being stored within one logical partition. The

examiner is reading the identification process be partially automated as being automatic

and associated with one or more topics by a lawyer, paralegal or other trained persons

as the targeted delivery and or manual process as being stored within one logical

partition.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to include Chu's teaching of a plurality of sources of KID that

was segregated KID into personal and professional levels of logical partitions disclosed

by Kemp. Doing so would provide a means for effectively accessing and storing KID on

different subsets where targeted delivery is at least partially automated such that, upon

request, said delivery KID is stored in said one logical partition.

As per claim 16, Claim 16 is recited similar limitations as Claim 1. The

limitations are substantially the same as **Claim 1**; therefore, the rejection of Claim 1 also

applies to Claim 16.

As per Claim 17, and also applied to Claim 1, the combination of Chu and

Kemp teaches "wherein said clustering of KID within said standardized scheme is

adapted to particular needs of an industry, a company, a business unit of said company,

department within said company, a group and/or a team within said department, and

individual employees of said company" as the scheme provided (Kemp, paragraph

0042) is computerized for legal and other professional subjects (Kemp, paragraph

0003).

As per Claim 22, Claim 22 is recited similar limitations as Claim 1. The

limitations are substantially the same as **Claim 1**; therefore, the rejection of Claim 1 also

applies to Claim 22.

11.   Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu U.S

20030065663 A1 (hereinafter referred as Chu) in view of Kemp U.S 20040024775 A1

(hereinafter referred as Kemp) and in view of Harrow et al US PGPub 2002/0040369 A1

(hereinafter referred as Multer).

As per Claim 18, and also applied to Claim 1, the combination of Chu and

Kemp does not explicitly teaches "wherein said rules for allocating KID include:

maintaining a minimum number of electronic storage locations by eliminating software

application default storage locations; implementing a minimum number of total

electronic and physical storage locations; using said priority based scheme of said

plurality of logical partitions to dictate an appropriate storage level for KID that could be

placed in more than one level and subset within said levels; using a general subset for

segregating KID that properly references more than one of subset of said logical

partitions; naming all KID so as to include at least a date and content information in a

title thereof; employing a numerical indication of priority within a selected subset when

said selected subset contains a relatively large number of KID; maximizing exposure to

guides, maps and labels itemizing contents of said logical partitions to highlight

pathways for locating KID; when one subset of said plurality of logical partitions exceeds

a predetermined number of KID storage items, re-organizing said subset through sub-

categorization; consistently labeling UKIDS levels and subsets to reflect contents of said

logical partitions; establishing guidelines for duration of KID storage in physical UKIDS

storage means; and naming subset KID storage categories to describe content and

context of the KID being stored therein".

On the other hand, it is well known in the art to minimizing storage, putting a

document in more than one logical partition, naming documents after their contents,

putting shortcuts on the desktop as evidence provided by Multer. Multer teaches such

limitation as the universal record format allows the application objects to support a wide

range of extensible application item types such as contacts, calendar, mail, bookmarks,

and the like. Flexible type name and value associations permit synchronization without

regard to individual vendor application information formats. Each application object

encapsulates mapped knowledge from the vendor unique format to the universal format

of the present invention. As such, an application object can be designed to support any

combination of application and binary information types. In essence, application objects

can be designed to support a vendor application using only binary file synchronization if

the internal format of the application is not known. (Multer, paragraph 0191) And In one

particular aspect of the present invention, encoding of the data packages may be

provided in a streaming format to allow processing by the device engines with minimal

storage and memory configuration at the device engine level (Multer, paragraph 0236).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify the combination of Chu and Kemp to include rules for

naming and minimizing storage in view of Multer. Doing so would provide a means for

effectively maintain necessary documents to the clients.

12.   Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu U.S

20030065663 A1 (hereinafter referred as Chu) in view of Kemp U.S 20040024775 A1

(hereinafter referred as Kemp) and in view of Harrow et al US PGPub 2003/0009518 A1

(hereinafter referred as Harrow).

As per Claim 19, and also applied to Claim 1, the combination of Chu and

Kemp teaches "wherein said rules for purging KID include, at a predetermined time

period: separating KID into a first category of KID that is needed, a second category of

KID that is not needed but retained on hand, and a third category of KID that is not

needed and not retained; purging said third category; and placing said second category

into a long term storage location" as purging of content in the system related to the

ability to remove distributed copies of a file from the systems the files were distributed

to. This maybe tied into the expiry date of a file, which may be set by the author, or the

necessity to recall a file which had already been distributed. One method of doing this

may be by using a domain administrator's account to automatically purge the relevant

content. Another way of doing this would be to have an agent program running which

would listen for requests from the system. On receiving a request to delete a file, it

would remove the file from the local directory (Harrow, paragraph 0075).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify the combination of Chu and Kemp to include purge

policy in view of Harrow. Doing so would provide a means for effectively maintain

necessary documents to the clients.

13.   Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu U.S

20030065663 A1 (hereinafter referred as Chu) in view of Kemp U.S 20040024775 A1

(hereinafter referred as Kemp) and in view of Francis et al. US PGPub 2003/0101153

A1 (hereinafter referred as Francis).

As per Claim 20 and also applied to Claim 1, the combination of Chu and

Kemp does not explicitly teach "wherein said rules for purging KID include, when an

employee leaves a position, providing a copy of said plurality of personal levels to said

employee, moving said plurality of personal levels to a long term storage location, and

purging said personal levels from said UKIDS" as On the other hand, Francis teaches

such limitation as when an employee leaves a company, much of their every day

expertise remains behind in notebooks and reports. Most of this information is not the

highly confidential information about the employer's business, but everyday skills like

what to when a particular machine has a certain problem, or what pitfalls occur when

running a particular type of experiment. All "green" access coded question and answer

pairs are not sensitive and thus the subset asked by an individual may be retained to

form his or her personal knowledge base. Since Company 30 wants to protect its

confidential (red coded) and semi-confidential (amber-coded) materials from falling into

the hands of competitors they will probably not allow individuals to retain these items in

personal databases. Nevertheless, the green coded items will still represent a

significant advance on the inconvenience of losing all notes by leaving notebooks with

the employer (Francis, paragraph 0162).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify the combination of Chu and Kemp to include policy

regarding knowledge be retained with the leaving employee in view of Francis. Doing so

would provide a means for effectively distinguishing personal knowledge from

confidential knowledge relevant to leaving employees.

14.   Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu U.S

20030065663 A1 (hereinafter referred as Chu) in view of Kemp U.S 20040024775 A1

(hereinafter referred as Kemp) and in view of Manohar et al. US PGPub 2002/0002571

A1 (hereinafter referred as Manohar).

As per Claim 21, and also applied to Claim 1, the combination of Chu and

Kemp does not explicitly teach "wherein said rules for sharing and distributing KID

include: prior to when an employee leaves a position, having said employee provide

their successor employee a tour of said plurality of logical partitions within said UKIDS

and identify important KID stored therein; identifying to a recipient receiver a targeted

location for storing distributed KID within one of said plurality of logical partitions; and

employing quantity reduction and content quality improvement goals for reducing a

volume of distributed KID".

On the other hand, Manohar teaches such limitation as browsers enabled with the touring features of the present invention would be capable of interactive network assisted navigation and touring of one more web sites with abilities to branch out of a tour and resume the tour at the last node, and insert tours within a tour. Tours can also be used as an artifact for exchanging viewpoints between users rather exchange URLs and recommended traversal path (Manohar, paragraph 0105).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Chu and Kemp to include a tour for the users to exchange URLs of documents in view of Manohar. Doing so would provide a means for effectively exchange knowledge from between employees.

Response to Arguments

15.   Applicant's arguments filed November 8, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Please see discussions below.

16.   On page 11, lines 1 – 13, with regarding general inventive concepts, the applicants' representative provides evidence to support the definition of Knowledge management as recognizing that "what begin as data...can, with increasing amounts of human context and assimilation, be promoted to the status of information, then knowledge,...then wisdom". And thus the representative further argues that Kemp reference is not seen to disclose or suggest even a conventional knowledge management system as would be know to those of ordinary skill in the art.

As to the above argument, the Examiner respectfully submits that Kemp does not need to disclose anything over and above the invention as claimed in order to render it unpatentable or anticipate. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claimed limitations. For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

1.   On page 11, lines 14 – 20, regarding claims 1 and 16, the representative argues that the combination of Chu and Kemp does not teach "a first segmenting of KID between personal and professional categories".

As to the above argument, the Examiner respectfully submits that the combination of Chu and Kemp teaches such limitation as by indicating In some embodiments of the invention it is advantageous to break down information within a given field into a number of analytical topics, such as those listed herein as examples within the legal field, and to classify information within those topics as belonging to one or more types, where those types are the same or substantially the same or similar across all or most of the topics. For example, in a system for providing legal information using the topic list set out above, the types or classes "administrative action," "current rulemaking," "news," "recent cases," and "legislative alert" have been found to be widely applicable. In some embodiments the use of such widely applicable types or classes can assist the processing and accessing of information. Information can also be broken

down according to, and assigned identifiers as belonging to, one or more layers of

subtopics, such topic "property" and subtopics "real estate," "ownership," and "deed of

trust." Designation of topics, subtopics, and types or classes may be according to an

index tree or other scheme provided, or agreed to, by provider 101(See Kemp Page 5

Paragraph 0042).

2.   On page 11, lines 20 – 26, regarding claims 1 and 16, the representative argues

that the combination of Chu and Kemp does not teach the limitation of "partitions of KID

that are universal and thus, not arbitrary or relevant to only one industry".

        As to the above argument, the Examiner respectfully submits that such limitation

regarding "partitions of KID that are universal and thus, not arbitrary or relevant to only

one industry" is not recited in any of the claims 1 and 16.

        Please further note In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023,

1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the

claim are not read into the claim. > E-Pass Techs., Inc. v. 3Com Corp., 343 F.3d 1364,

1369, 67 USPQ2d 1947, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (claims must be interpreted "in view of

the specification" without importing limitations from the specification into the claims

unnecessarily).

17.   On page 12, regarding claims 1 and 16, the representative argues that the

combination of Chu and Kemp does not teach the amended independent claims 1 and

16. However the arguments are directed to newly added limitations that have been

addressed in the citation of the Action as discussed above.

3.   On page 13, regarding newly added claims, the representative cites several

paragraph numbers to provide support of not including new matters in the newly added

claims 17 - 22.

However, the Examiner respectfully submits that these paragraph numbers are

not originated from the filed specification but rather from the US Patent Publication. The

representative is advised to use citations referring to the original filed disclosure.

4.   On page 13, lines 17 - 21, regarding additional documents, the representative

provide Exhibit A to clarify to a term "information pyramid". However, the statement is

broad and not related to any specific limitations of the filed claims. Therefore, even the

Examiner has considered the Exhibit A, the relationship between the Exhibit A and the

claims at issue has not been established.

5.   On page 13, lines 22 – 27, regarding additional documents, the representative

further directs that encouraging personal defined and individual storage of knowledge

teaches away from the present invention especially to the which is recited in the claims

where a universal knowledge, information and data store is recited, including an

interface for segmenting and storing KID in, for example, a priority based and

standardized scheme, and which includes the rules and tools for configuring the

knowledge store and for storing and accessing KID stored therein.

As to the above direction, the Examiner respectfully submits that the above mentioned limitation are directed to newly added limitations that have been addressed in the citation of the Action as discussed above.

Conclusion

6.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

References

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a.   Kadoma-shi discloses a group forming system, group forming apparatus, group forming method, program, and medium in EP 1 209599 A2

b.   Bowman discloses clean up of orphaned server contexts in US Patent No.

6496850.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to VEI-CHUNG LIANG whose telephone number is

(571)270-1984. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thursday, 7:30AM -

6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Pierre M. Vital can be reached on (571) 272-4215. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

May 23, 2008   /klu/
/V. L./
Vei-Chung Liang, Ph.D.
Examiner, Art Unit 2169

/Pierre M. Vital/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2169